

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/628,967 | 07/28/2003 | Jeffrey Allen Nielsen | 200309751-1 | 6185 |
| 22879 | 7590 01/24/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION | | | RAO, G NAGESH | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| FORT COLLI | FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400 | | | |

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/628,967 | NIELSEN ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | G. Nagesh Rao | 1722 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet w | ith the correspondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | OATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A | CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 N | | | | | | |
| , | · | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa | • | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under | Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.L | J. 11, 403 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16 and 26</u> is/are pending in the ap | Claim(s) <u>1-16 and 26</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) 1-16 and 26 is/are rejected. | 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16 and 26</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | or election requirement. | | | | | |
| | • | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E | | | | | | |
| ,_ | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Burea | | • | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | Summary (PTO-413) | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 | | (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other: | | | | | | |

Art Unit: 1722

Election/Restrictions

1) Claims 17-25 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 7/29/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2) Claims 1-16 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Schmidt (US Patent No. 6,841,116).

Schmidt 116 teaches a solid freeform fabrication apparatus as indicated by Figure 1, where the device shows a dispensing system capable of dispensing a variety of materials including a support material and build material stored in their own separate first and second compartments (49 and 50) before being dispensed by an ink-jet printing dispensing system (24) capable of being configured for uni or bi-directional printing onto a build platform (14), and a means for heating as well

Art Unit: 1722

as curing as seen in Figure 1 by the heaters (25) and the UV radiation source (38) of the build material (Col 15 Lines 38-45), as well a planarizer (32) which reads on as a type of milling device for surface texturing the 3-dimensional object fabricated as well as aiding in the removal and streamlining of excess waste material capable of doing so for either support or build material waste removal, and a computer system (34 and 40) as a control system capable of operating the controls for the dispensing and curing system (Also See Col 12 Lines 34-68 and Col 13 Lines 40-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1722

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3) Claims 7-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt (US Patent No. 6,841,116) in view of Cohen (US Patent No. 5,287,435).

Schmidt 116 from the aforementioned pertains to a solid freeform fabrication device that is used for 3-dimensional prototyping.

Schmidt 116 however it teaches a planarizer, but in an effort to strengthen the argument that the planarizer is equivalent to a milling system, and for the matter that a milling system is commonly known and used in the art, examiner presents the teachings of Cohen 435.

Cohen 435 depicts a freeform fabrication apparatus system (See Figures 1 and 2 and Col 10 Lines 64-68 and Col 11 Lines 1-5). Where it is commonly taught to incorporate a type of milling system where there is a vacuum unit and cutter capable of trimming and evening the surface of the layered material deposited by the freeform fabrication apparatus, as well removing the excess waste material from portion machined by the milling system.

It would be obvious at the time of the invention to one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Schmidt 116 with the teachings of Cohen 435 with respect to a milling system would benefit the apparatus of Schmidt 116 to aid in the fabrication and trimming of excess material for a more finished product.

Art Unit: 1722

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to G. Nagesh Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2946. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GNR

ROBERT DAVIS PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP-1300 / 7~

1/19/04